

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 9-14, 17-23, and 33-35 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 9-10, 12-13, 17-20, 22-23 and 33. No claims have been withdrawn or cancelled by this Amendment. New claims 34-35 have been added by this Amendment.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0003] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, or if the Examiner should have questions regarding the invention or the location in the specification of support for any claim elements, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can discuss this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0004] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0005] Without conceding to the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 9-10, 12-13, 17-20, 22-23 and 33 herein. Applicant amends these claims to clarify the claimed

features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and to more quickly identify allowable subject matter, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

[0006] Furthermore, Applicant has added new claims 34-35 herein, which are directed towards the same invention as claims 9-14, 17-23 and 33. These new claims are fully supported by the Application and therefore do not constitute new matter. New claim 34 and amended dependent claim 13 are supported, for example, at FIG. 13 and paragraph 0069 of the published present Application (US2005/0091213). Similarly, new claim 35 is supported, for example, at paragraph 0037.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0007] Claims 9-14, 17-23 and 33 stand rejected under § 103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0008] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references in combination:

- **Botz:** *Botz, et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0177388 (published March 15, 2002);
- **Kao:** *Kao, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,651,168 (issued January 29, 1999); and
- **Axel:** *Axel, et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2004/0139355 (Published November 7, 2002).

Overview of the Application

[0009] The Application describes a technology for logging a user on to a local machine using one or more credentials that are translated with one of a plurality of different credential provider modules initialized with a logon user interface. Each credential provider module translates a corresponding different type of credential into a common credential protocol. The translated credential is communicated through a logon UI module to an operating system (OS) of a local

machine. An OS logon module is called by the logon UI module to authenticate the translated credential against a credential database. A user identified by the translated credential is logged on to access the local machine when the authentication is successful.

Cited References

[0010] The Examiner cites Botz as the primary reference in the anticipation-and/or obviousness-based rejections. The Examiner cites Kao and Axel as secondary references in the obviousness-based rejections.

Botz

[0011] Botz teaches a technology for authenticated identity translation based on a trust relationship between multiple user identification and authentication services resident on different computing units of a multiple computing unit environment. The technology includes recording user identification and authentication events occurring within the trusted domain, and making this information available to other computing units within the domain by generating tokens representative of the identification and authentication events. A token is forwarded with a request to one or more computing units of the domain, which in turn provide the token to a domain controller to translate user identities between respective computing units.

Kao

[0012] Kao teaches a technology for an authentication framework subsystem that enables a computer system to authenticate a user with a selected one of a plurality of authentication processes. Each of the

authentication processes has a distinct sequence of steps and a unique input/output (I/O) interface for exchanging authentication information with the computer system. The invention includes an authentication framework in the computer system. An application program interface in the authentication framework provides an interface to an I/O component, such as a graphical user interface (GUI), of the computer system. A plurality of authentication modules interface with the framework. Each module has a conversation function driver defining a programmed sequence of steps to authenticate a user with a distinct authentication process.

Axel

[0013] Axel includes a method of accessing a plurality of network elements with at least one network element management program running on at least one element manager. The method comprises the steps of capturing a username and a password within the network element management program and submitting the captured username and password to each of the plurality of network elements so as to effect administrative address privileges for each of said plurality of network elements without re-capturing said username and said password. The purpose of the method is to capture the username and password of the user in order to log the user into individual network elements without having to reenter his username and password.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0014] Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Rejections Based upon Combination of Botz with Kao

[0015] Claims 9-11, 13-14, 17-19, 21-23 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Botz combine with Kao. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims, and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims for the following reasons.

Independent Claims 9, 17 and 22

[0016] Applicant submits that the combination of Botz with Kao does not teach or suggest at least the following elements as recited in independent claim 9 (with emphasis added):

...initializing, by a native operating system (OS) on a local machine, a logon user interface (UI);

initializing with the logon UI on the local machine a plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules, each for translating respectively different types of credentials into a common credential protocol, the common credential protocol being

compatible with the native OS of the local machine, each said credential provider module enabling a user to log on with the native OS on the local machine via the logon UI to access the local machine using one of a plurality of corresponding different input devices that are capable of being in communication with the local machine....

Thus, according to this aspect of Applicant's invention, a plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules are initialized with the logon user interface. Each credential provider module is used for translating respectively different types of credentials into a common credential protocol that is compatible with the native OS of the local machine. Further, each of the different credential provider modules enables a user to log on with the native OS on the local machine via the logon UI to access the local machine using one of a plurality of corresponding different input devices that are capable of being in communication with the local machine.

[0017] The Office Action states at Page 3, that Botz does not explicitly disclose a plurality of different input devices. The Office Action further indicates at Page 3 that Kao discloses a local machine capable of being in communication with a plurality of different input devices, citing FIG. 1A and col. 8, lines 22-26 and 38-48 of Kao. However, the recited portions of Kao fail to teach or suggest initializing with the logon UI on the local machine a plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules, each for translating respectively different types of credentials into a common credential protocol, the common credential protocol being compatible with the native OS of the local machine, as recited in Applicant's claim 9. Instead, Kao is directed to an authentication framework 200

that teaches that external APIs 214, 214' and 214'' within the authentication framework are exposed to interfaces 202, 204 and 206, respectively, for all authentication-related operations within the authentication framework 200 (col. 8, lines 22-32). Thus, instead of teaching Applicant's method in which a plurality of different credential provider modules are initialized with a logon UI at the local machine for translating different types of credentials to a common credential protocol, Kao teaches multiple interfaces 202, 204 and 206 that communicate with APIs 214, 214' and 214''. For example, at col. 9, lines 30-44, Kao teaches that the APIs 214, 214', 214'' include conversation functions and interpreter processors. Thus, Kao's interfaces 202, 204, and 206 perform no translation function for translating different credential types to a common credential protocol, unlike the plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules initialized with the logon UI of Applicant's claim 9.

[0018] In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Botz, nor Kao teaches or suggests initializing, with the logon UI on the local machine, a plurality of different coexisting credential provider modules, each for translating respectively different types of credentials into a common credential protocol, the common credential protocol being compatible with the native OS of the local machine, each said credential provider module enabling a user to log on with the native OS on the local machine via the logon UI to access the local machine using one of a plurality of corresponding different input devices. Consequently, as neither of these references teaches or suggests this feature of Applicant's invention, the combination thereof also cannot teach or suggest this feature. Axel is cited as being relevant to the subject matter of claims 12, 20

and 23, and provides no teachings regarding the subject matter of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 9.

[0019] Independent claims 17 and 22 include limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 9, and are allowable under a similar rationale.

Independent Claim 33

[0020] Independent claim 33 includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 9, and is allowable under a similar rationale. In addition, claim 33 includes (with emphasis added):

...receiving a first credential from the user at a first said input device in communication with the local machine;

receiving a second credential from the user at a second said input device in communication with the local machine;

translating the first credential into the common credential protocol using a first one of the credential provider modules corresponding to the first input device that is in communication with the local machine;

translating the second credential into the common credential protocol using a second one of the credential provider modules corresponding to the second input device that is in communication with the local machine;

using a component of the OS to authenticate the translated first credential and second credential having the common credential protocol against a credential database; and

logging the user on with the OS to access the local machine when the authentication of both the first credential and the second credential is successful.

According to this aspect of Applicant's invention, both first and second credentials are received and translated by first and second credential provider modules, respectively. The logging on of the user with the OS is performed when authentication of both the first credential and the second credential is successful.

[0021] The Office Action asserts on Page 14 that this aspect is taught by Botz at par. 0094 and par. 0099-0106, and by Kao at col. 9, line 66 through col. 10, line 10; col. 8 line 64-67. However, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited portions of Botz or Kao teach or suggest a method using a first credential translated by a first credential provider module and a second credential translated by a second credential provider module, that includes logging the user on with an OS on a local machine when the authentication of both the first credential and the second credential is successful. For example, the cited portion of Botz at par. 0094 teaches that the AIT domain server accesses policy information about both the request server and the initial authentication server. However, this is not the same as receiving a first credential from a user and a second credential from a user, translating these credentials to a common credential protocol using respective first and second

credential provider modules, and logging the user on with the OS when authentication of both the first credential and the second credential is successful.

[0022] Similarly, Kao at col. 8, lines 64-67 only teaches that a smart card 222 is plugged into the smart card reader 220 and a user's DCE ID and password is stored in the smart card. The user needs to be authenticated by the smart card and its smart card authentication module 210. Then, the authentication framework 200 can retrieve the user's DCE ID and password from the smart card and use them to sign the user on. Thus, this portion of Kao does not teach a first credential translated by a first credential provider module and a second credential translated by a second credential provider module, as recited in Applicant's claim 33. Accordingly, as neither of these references teaches or suggests this feature of Applicant's invention, the combination thereof also cannot teach or suggest this feature. Axel is cited as being relevant to the subject matter of claims 12, 20 and 23, and provides no teachings regarding the subject matter of claim 33. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 33 is allowable over the Botz, Kao, Alex and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination.

Independent Claim 34

[0023] New independent claim 34 includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 9, and is allowable under a similar rationale. In addition, claim 34 includes (with emphasis added):

initializing one or more pre-logon access provider (PLAP) modules at the local machine coexisting with said credential provider modules, each PLAP module being interoperable with the OS of the local machine for enabling the user to select a logon connection type out of a plurality of logon connection types for establishing a network connection;

receiving a first said credential from the user at a first one of said input devices in communication with the local machine;

translating the first credential with a first one of said credential provider modules corresponding to the first input device that is in communication with the local machine;

establishing by a selected one of said PLAP modules a network connection from the local machine to a domain using the translated first credential....

Thus, according to this aspect of Applicants invention, one or more pre-logon access provider (PLAP) modules are initialized at the local machine, coexisting with said credential provider modules, each PLAP module being interoperable with the OS of the local machine for enabling the user to select a logon connection type out of a plurality of logon connection types for establishing a network connection. Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the art of record teaches or suggests this aspect of Applicant's invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 34 is allowable over Botz, Kao, Alex and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination.

Independent Claim 35

[0024] New independent claim 35 includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 9, and is allowable under a similar rationale. In addition, claim 35 includes (with emphasis added):

...allowing a user to choose one of said plurality of different types of input devices to be used for logging on....

Thus, according to this aspect of Applicants invention, the user is able to choose which of a plurality of different types of input devices the user will use to log on to the local machine. Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the art of record teaches or suggests this aspect of Applicant's invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 35 is allowable over Botz, Kao, Alex and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination.

Dependent Claims

[0025] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0026] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

_____/Colin D. Barnitz/_____
Dated: 8/6/2008

Colin D. Barnitz (colin@leehayes.com; 512-505-8167)

Registration No. 35061

Emmanuel Rivera (emmanuel@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162)

Registration No. 45760

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (512) 505-8167

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com